REMARKS

Docket No.: 0630-1979P

The Examiner is thanked for the due consideration given the application. No new matter is believed to be added to the application by this Response.

Status Of The Claims

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, 9 and 12 are independent.

Election/Restriction

The Examiner has restricted the claims of the invention into the following two groups:

- I. Claims 1-8, drawn to a method for forming and active substrate for an LCD.
- II. Claims 9-14, drawn to a method for forming a color filter substrate for an LCD and an LCD having the color filter substrate.

The Examiner requires election of one of the aforesaid groups for prosecution on the merits.

Applicants elect Group I (claims 1-8) with traverse.

If Group I is elected, the Examiner requires election of the following species if no generic claim is found to be allowable:

- Group IA. An active substrate as shown in Fig 3 (claims 1-4).
- Group IB An active substrate formed as shown in Fig. 5 (claims 5-8).

Docket No.: 0630-1979P

Applicants elect the species of Group IA (claims 1-4) with traverse.

As set forth in Section 803 of the MPEP, the Examiner must examine an

application on the merits if the examination of the entire application can be made

without serious burden. Two criteria are identified for proper requirement for restriction:

1. The inventions must be independent or distinct as claimed; and

2. There must be a serious burden on the Examiner if the restriction is not

required.

Applicant respectfully submits that a serious burden has not been placed on the

Examiner to consider all of the claims in a single application. A review of the subject

matter set forth in the claims would have an overlapping search. Thus a different field

of search really does not exist with regard to the claims of the present application.

Further, Applicant particularly points out the interrelationship between Group I

and Group II. Independent claims 1 and 5 of Group I and independent 9 of Group II are

each drawn to a fabrication method for a liquid crystal display device. Claim 12 of

Group II is drawn to a liquid crystal display device. As a result, all the independent

claims of the present invention are so intimately interrelated that no undue burden is

3

placed upon the Examiner to examine all the claims of the invention.

Accordingly, rejoinder and examination of all of the claims of the invention on the

merits is respectfully requested.

EHC/REG/

Application No. 10/814,141 Response dated January 6, 2006 Reply to Office Action of December 6, 2005

Docket No.: 0630-1979P

Conclusion

If there are any questions regarding this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert E. Goozner, Ph.D. (Reg. No. 42,593) at 703-205-8000.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: January 6, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Esther H. Chong

Registration No.: 40,953

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant